

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----X		
MANISHA SINGH,	:	:
	:	
Plaintiff,	:	
	:	
-against-	:	
	:	<b>ORDER</b>
	:	17 CV 3935 (GBD) (KNF)
MEMORIAL SLOAN KETTERING CANCER	:	
CENTER, et al.,	:	
	:	
Defendants.	:	
-----X		
KEVIN NATHANIEL FOX		
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE		

On April 8, 2020, plaintiff Manisha Singh, proceeding pro se, filed a document styled "Notice of Motion for Leave to Renew," accompanied by an affidavit supporting the motion. See Docket Entry No. 116. The plaintiff indicates that the motion is made pursuant to New York Civil Practice Law and Rules ("CPLR") section 2221(e). The same notice of motion and affidavit were filed by the plaintiff on April 16, 2020; they appear at Docket Entry No. 117 and 118 respectively. Through the motions, the plaintiff requests that the Court reconsider the determination it made, via the February 11, 2020 Memorandum and Order, to deny the plaintiff's application for the Court to appoint pro bono counsel to represent her in this action.

Local Civil Rule 6.3 of this court provides that

a notice of motion for reconsideration or reargument of a court order determining a motion shall be served within fourteen (14) days after the Court's determination of the original motion.... There shall be served with the notice of motion a memorandum setting forth concisely the matters or controlling decisions which counsel believes the Court has overlooked.... No affidavits shall be filed by any party unless directed by the Court.

The plaintiff's motions were not made timely, as they were filed approximately two months after the order she seeks to have reconsidered by the Court. In addition, although the plaintiff filed affidavits supporting her motions without the Court's permission to do so and, thus, in contravention of the express language of the relevant Local Civil Rule of this court, she did not file the required

memorandum of law identifying the matters or controlling law she contends the Court overlooked. Furthermore, the plaintiff's motions are made pursuant to the CPLR, which does not govern procedural matters pertaining to this action; such matters are governed by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Since the plaintiff's motions do not comply with Local Civil Rule 6.3 of this court, they are denied. This order resolves Docket Entry No. 116 and 117.

Dated: New York, New York  
September 4, 2020

SO ORDERED:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
KEVIN NATHANIEL FOX  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE